

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEVIN LONG,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CRABTREE,

Defendant.

1:23-cv-01073-JLT-GSA-PC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

(ECF No. 8.)

On August 23, 2023, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the Court cannot require an attorney to represent Plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). However, in certain exceptional circumstances the Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525.

Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether “exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success

1 of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the
2 complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

3 Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court will seek
4 volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether
5 “exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success
6 of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the
7 complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

8 In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. The
9 court finds it unlikely that plaintiff will succeed on the merits of this case. Plaintiff’s complaint
10 awaits the court’s screening required under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Thus, to date the court has not
11 found any cognizable claims in plaintiff’s complaint for which to initiate service of process,
12 and no other parties have yet appeared. The legal issue in this case, whether Plaintiff’s rights to
13 campaign for President while in jail have been violated, is not complex. Moreover, based on a
14 review of the record in this case, the court finds that plaintiff can adequately articulate his
15 claims. Therefore, plaintiff’s motion shall be denied, without prejudice to renewal of the
16 motion at a later stage of the proceedings.

17 Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s motion for the appointment of counsel
18 is HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: August 24, 2023

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE